



University of South Florida
Scholar Commons

Faculty Senate Publications

Faculty Senate

1-1-2003

AY 2002/2003 SEC meeting minutes: 03 Mar 05

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs

Scholar Commons Citation

Faculty Senate, "AY 2002/2003 SEC meeting minutes: 03 Mar 05" (2003). *Faculty Senate Publications*. Paper 126.
http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/fs_pubs/126

This Agenda/Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

MINUTES

March 5, 2003

Present: Glen Besterfield, Elizabeth Bird, Julian Dwornik, Susan Greenbaum, William Kealy, Jana Futch Martin, Kelli McCormack-Brown, Cheryl McCoy, Gregory Paveza, John Richmond, Nancy Jane Tyson

Provost's
Office: Phil Smith, David Stamps

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The Minutes of February 5, 2003, were approved as amended.

PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND ANNOUNCEMENTS (Gregory Paveza)

President Paveza announced that he has transmitted to the Provost and President Proposed Academic Policies 10-048 (Academic Freedom and Responsibility) and 10-049 (Peer Advisory Committee on Faculty Termination). Once they make their decisions about them, the policies will go into affect once they are approved. One of the policies will require that procedures be put into place for peer review in the case of termination.

President Paveza commented that as a note to his successor, whoever that person may be, one of the added responsibilities for the Senate President will be serving as part of the leadership team for SACS accreditation because there is a SACS expectation that the leadership team will be comprised of only four people, basically the President, Provost, President of the Faculty Senate, and Dr. Kathleen Moore. President Paveza now has background information so that he can brief his successor once the Senate election is completed in April so that they can be prepared when they take office in August.

A third issue that President Paveza wanted to speak about is that, in addition to some of the other changes that must happen with the Constitution and Bylaws, he is looking at the date when the Senate President takes office. The outgoing President holds office until the first day of classes in the fall term. He feels that it would make more sense, in the long run, for the Senate President to take office in May, after the end of the term and then have the summer to ramp up and slide into the office.

President Paveza shared one final thought with the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) members, which was to let everyone know that after the time the indictment was handed down and Professor Al Arian was arrested, he and President Genshaft had several meetings to discuss the issue and talk about it at length. He also wanted to make folks aware that there was a clear meeting with the faculty in computer sciences and a chance for them to express their views, as well as a meeting with the members of the Faculty Senate from engineering, at which he was also present.

PROVOST'S REPORT (David Stamps)

Provost Stamps clarified that SACS will accept only four people for the review. Those four people would be the President, Provost, President of the Faculty Senate, and probably Campus Executive Officer Mercer from the Lakeland campus who is on the leadership team. Dr. Kathleen Moore is also on the leadership team, and she has already attended three or four meetings with SACS. Vice President Harold Nixon and Vice President Carl Carlucci will be on the team but will only operate internally primarily because their units will also be a part of SACS when SACS comes in. Provost Stamps has met with the chairs of the College of Arts and Sciences and talked about the SACS accreditation process, particularly about the idea of integrating research into the undergraduate curriculum. He will also be giving the same speech to the chairs in the College of Education, as well as to the administration on the St. Petersburg campus. Gordon Rule courses will also be reviewed to see if it is possible to integrate research as a part of the Gordon Rule requirements as well.

Provost Stamps announced that tenure nominations will no longer go to the state. Nominations will be ratified at the local level, and the Board of Trustees (BOT) will have that responsibility. The whole process should be much quicker this year.

Provost Stamps announced that this summer construction of a new parking structure would begin in on the north end of Lot 1 which is next to the Administration building. The new parking structure will accommodate 1,218 spaces. He pointed out that because of the amount of money that is available and interest rates now, there is a possibility it might be a little larger. Prior to the construction, there will be a 400 space surface parking lot created across from the College of Engineering.

At this time, the Provost distributed a "Report of the Provost's Faculty Task Force on Student Retention." He explained that most of the task forces in the past have been a combination of staff, some faculty, and in other cases, a task force primarily made up of advisors. However, the administration wanted to have faculty only look at retention, and get their responses. In their report, the task force made the following six recommendations:

Recommendation #1: Development of a Special Committee Dedicated to Student Retention.

The task force felt that retention is an issue that needs the attention of an ongoing task force that is constantly monitoring issues and concerns of student retention. The committee should be relatively small in size, and the membership should include faculty, professional staff, and the Provost's office. The members would have expertise in the area of student retention. This committee would work very closely with the Office of Institutional Research and be provided with all data concerning student retention, and they could continue to make recommendations and look at student retention over the long run. The members would also be in a position to identify best practice models from around the country and to make recommendations as to which practices to put into operation at USF.

Recommendation #2: Recruit a More Academically Capable Student Body

The committee made reference to SAT scores at USF and ranking in comparison to other state universities. USF ranks 6th out of the 11 universities in Florida. Having success in recruiting a lot of students gives the university an opportunity to become more selective.

Recommendation #3: Improve and Expand Data Concerning Retention-Related Issues

The university can benefit from a better understanding of specific reasons why students drop out or why they stop-out. Very often USF has students that drop out, and they become a part of a retention problem, but they have not really dropped out, they have stopped out. They return and, in some cases, they transfer to other institutions within the state university system. Therefore, they have not been completely lost. USF does not have very much data, or some do not feel comfortable with the type of data USF does have. The task force is also recommending that the Office of Institutional Research conduct more in-depth studies related to student retention.

Recommendation #4A – 4C: Improve Undergraduate Advising

The task force recommends that the new committee should decide on whether or not to adopt a professional versus a faculty advising system. The task force also suggested looking at where pre-major advising should be physically placed. That is, should it remain in Student Affairs or be moved to Academic Affairs?

Recommendation #5: Reduce the “USF Shuffle”

The task force recommended that an attempt should be made to consolidate advising and have everyone sent to the Special Events Center to avoid/reduce the “USF Shuffle.” This is something that needs some coordination throughout the university in terms of registration, financial aid, student health services, etc., so that the students can get the services they need.

Recommendation #6: Continue and Expand Present Efforts to Improve the Academic Experiences of USF Students

In addition to integrating research into the curriculum, the task force also suggested that USF hire sufficient faculty and instructors to adequately support the undergraduate student body or undergraduate education. In addition, it was recommended that there should also be more graduate assistants, particularly for faculty that are assigned to large classes so that the undergraduates will have accessibility to graduate students. They also suggested that faculty take more advantage of the Center for Teaching Enhancement to ensure that instructive and graduate assistants have English speaking abilities at the level needed for student comprehension.

Provost Stamps indicated that members of the SEC would receive a copy of the full report.

Provost Stamps announced that the administration wants to offer summer school at least at the same level as last year, even though USF is suffering from the possibility of major budget cuts. It does not seem that the State Legislature is willing to increase taxes or tuition.

The Provost pointed out that the primary concern of summer school is faculty salaries. USF receives a certain amount of money from the state for appropriations and also in terms of salaries. Faculty are paid over nine months out of those funds which means that all of the money

for faculty salaries is allocated over nine months. This, in turn, means money must be generated for faculty during the summer. Tuition brings in about one fourth of the cost. The other costs come from general revenue funds. USF receives approximately \$6,000 per student from general revenue funds, and approximately \$2,000 from tuition. Discussions have been held about going to a cash-based summer school; in other words, run summer school independent of all other funds. If this did happen, USF would run into a problem of losing any opportunity of getting additional general revenue funds. USF depends upon summer school to generate the FTE that is needed to meet its corridor. Since USF is over its corridor, it may be possible to run summer school because USF already has those students. The situation has been modeled, and each time USF attempts it, it ends up losing money from where it needs it. Maybe in the future, there might be a way of handling this.

The other problem is that every time USF gets a tuition increase, it is not an enhancement, but a replacement. The only enhancement USF would have is the optional tuition increase and that would be the five percent. To attempt to keep on track and work toward a mission as a Research I university and having the necessary classes for the students to graduate, brings up concerns of how does one balance that with the significant budget cuts with which USF is faced. Faculty cannot be asked to do more, more, and more. The Provost pointed out that he is very proud of this faculty, and that everything they have been asked to do, they have done.

REPORTS BY OFFICERS AND COUNCIL CHAIRS

a. Undergraduate Council Report on Grade Quality Points for A – (Glen Besterfield)

President Paveza asked for a report from Chair Besterfield regarding the Undergraduate Council's decision regarding quality points for A-. Chair Besterfield reported that based upon grade inflation information received and reviewed, the Undergraduate Council unanimously voted not to change the quality points for A-.

Graduate Council Chair Kelli McCormack-Brown reported that because the Council was completely unsuccessful in getting someone from Student Government to meet with the group, the Graduate Council does not approve changing the quality points.

President Paveza stated that given the fact that both councils have recommended that the grade point stay the same, the SEC had two options. One, the issue could be discussed at today's meeting before presenting it to the full Senate with a series of recommendations from the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, and the SEC. Second, since both councils have come forward with a negative recommendation the issue would not go to the full Senate, and would die in committee. President Paveza would make it part of his report to the Senate that both the Undergraduate and the Graduate Councils reported a negative recommendation on any change in the grade point system and that, therefore, at this point that recommendation from the Student Government Senate is considered dead in committee and will not be reported out to the full Senate for consideration. It was unanimously decided to let the issue die in committee.

b. Undergraduate Council Report (Glen Besterfield)

The Undergraduate Council was asked by Tallahassee to look at grade changes that occur over a certain period of time. It was discovered that the period of time ranges from two years (UCF) to unlimited (USF and UF).

Chair Besterfield announced that all course proposals have to go electronic.

c. Graduate Council (Kelli McCormack-Brown)

Chair McCormack-Brown announced that the Graduate Council continues to look at new programs and is concerned about the quality of proposals that are coming through. New proposals for the doctoral and masters programs are being rushed through the process, and the Council has been grappling with that issue.

d. Permanent Rules Committee (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin announced that the Permanent Rules Committee would begin going through the rules one by one, treating them as a separate set of rules for faculty. The next meeting of the Permanent Rules Committee will be Friday, March 14th.

President Paveza announced that the Governance Committee would be meeting the next day and they would also be reviewing the rules one by one.

e. Senate Elections (Jana Futch Martin)

Secretary Martin announced that Senate elections are underway. The deadline for receipt of ballots in the Faculty Senate Office is 5:00 p.m., Thursday, March 6th. She also announced that the ballot for the College of Public Health was lost in the campus mail. Therefore, a second one was sent out using a different color. To date, none from the first mailing have been received.

f. Instructional Technology and Distance Learning Council (William Kealy)

The main discussion at the last Instructional Technology Council meeting was the role of technology in the new general education plan. The Council wants to use the opportunity to have a good exploration of those possibilities in preparation for the initial SACS meetings that were held earlier in February. The members, at the end of the meeting, were charged with going out and researching what other higher institutions are doing as far as integrating technology into the curriculum. All the information was forwarded when the first SACS meeting was held. For example, Florida State actually has a technology test that students must pass at the graduate level, which shows some basic competencies in a real application (i.e., authentic demonstration) of the technology. The Council contributed quite a bit to that first meeting.

On the Adobe issue, USF has a contract. Christopher Akins has created a web site, and USF is waiting for the keys from Adobe before it can be implemented. Chair Kealy anticipates having the software up and running soon.

Chair Kealy announced that things are moving ahead very quickly with Macromedia. USF may be the first in the country that is trying an e-commerce approach in which USF takes the aggregate from all higher ed institutions in the state. This means USF goes in with a huge number and the software is tremendously discounted. At this time, Chair Kealy distributed copies of a presentation to be given by Macromedia the following day in the TECO Room at the College of Education. They will be showing a lot of their products geared toward faculty and something that is not going to be a bunch of bells and whistles, but rather things that have a rather shallow learning curve and a big return on investment. These are the types of things the Instructional Technology Council is hoping to do more of to get some interest in technology and its capability.

g. Committee on Committees (Cheryl McCoy)

Chair McCoy announced that the Committee on Committees (COC) was currently recruiting nominees to fill vacancies on the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Councils, as well as the University-Wide Committees and Councils. The deadline for applying was extended to Friday, March 6th. Chair McCoy commented that recruitment has been down somewhat this year because things were done on the web rather than via campus mail. The Committee on Committees will next review all of the nominations which will then be put forth at the April SEC meeting with recommendations.

Chair McCoy made reference to a recommendation proffered at the February SEC meeting about the procedure for filling a vacancy without going through the COC when a committee member either goes on a sabbatical and/or resigns. Chair McCoy has reviewed the *Bylaws* and noted that there is nothing stated for handling such vacancies.

Discussion was held and since the committees and councils are technically arms of the Faculty Senate, it was decided that the appropriate parliamentary procedure would be that the President of the Faculty Senate should make an appointment to the committee. The Senate President will, in turn, seek recommendations from the COC for people who have submitted their names before and then make an appointment from that list. It should not be the deans of the colleges making the appointments to replace people who go on sabbatical or resign. President Paveza asked Chair McCoy to draft a brief memo to send to all committee/council chairs to make them aware that if somebody resigns or steps down from a committee that the appropriate thing to do is to notify the chair of the COC who will notify the Senate President. The committee/council chairs should not accept any appointment that comes forward from the dean as a replacement; that is not the appropriate mechanism.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business to discuss.

NEW BUSINESS

a. Instructors Serving as Senators

The regional campuses, particularly St. Petersburg, but other units as well, have raised the issue as to whether or not it would be appropriate to amend the *Constitution* to permit people who serve at the rank of Instructor to serve in the Senate. President Paveza pointed out that although Instructors are part of the count for when determination of representation is made, they are not eligible to serve. President Paveza asked for discussion of this issue by the SEC.

After a brief discussion, the SEC members acknowledged that it was a non-issue because if all Instructors are non-tenure earning, they are on year-by-year contracts, and some of those contracts are renewed on a regular basis. The only stipulation would be if a student was in at Instructor rank and then that person would be precluded.

OTHER

Past President Nancy Jane Tyson stated that she was disturbed by President Genshaft's statement about the firing of Dr. Al Arian, the rhetorical deceptiveness she referred to as having consulting with Senate President Paveza and the engineering Senators and, of course, the President's statement that she had consulted with those individuals made it sound as if she had the approval of those individuals. In a way it made it sound as if President Genshaft had the Senate approval. There is nothing that really can be done about that because if President Paveza went to the Senate for a vote Past President Tyson added that she did not know what would happen and she would not want to do that. For the record she wanted to state she thinks that is rhetorically deceptive on the part of President Genshaft and found it objectionable.

President Paveza replied that he could understand the level of concern that it made it appear that the full Senate had somehow supported the position. He also stated for the record that, indeed, President Genshaft did consult with him and she, indeed, did have his approval. The engineering discussion was somewhat broader than that. It basically sought information, and she did not specifically ask them a, "what would you do" kind of question. President Genshaft knows President Paveza does not speak for the Senate and he did not have her think he was speaking for the entire Senate. He thinks the general feeling was that President Genshaft could not delay for very long making a decision, and to try and implement a process for which USF has no procedures yet would have required a delay in which he does not think she was prepared to engage at this point.

President Paveza added that he has seen a copy of the AAUP confidential report. Given the open records policy at USF, if asked to reproduce it, he would. He did respond to the report and one of the things in his response was that he was somewhat less pessimistic than the Investigating Committee about the future of academic freedom at this university. There were three things laid out by President Paveza. One of them was the General Faculty meeting and some of the issues and discussions and some of the results. Then, there were the two policies that the Faculty Senate passed last month that he believes will put procedures in place for peer review within a

relatively brief period of time. It is unknown what Committee A will do with the report once it goes to them. There was no recommendation in this report to committee. There was no clear stated recommendation, as he recalls, from the Investigating Committee about what Committee A should do.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.